# India

FOR THE

No. 34. New Series.
No. 128. Old Series.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, AUGUST 26, 1898.

Registered as a Newspaper. Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.


| | |
|---|---|
| Notes and News... | 113 |
| Sir Henry Lawrence... | 116 |
| India Seen Through Official Spectacles, by E. H. Pickersgill, M.P. | 116 |
| The Collapse of the "Jerry-Buildings," by an Anglo-Indian | 117 |
| More Currency Quackery | 118 |
| Our London Letter ... | 119 |
| Chronicle of the Week | 120 |
| Letters to the Editor: | |
| The Police at the Garshankar Riot | 121 |
| An Anglo-Indian Tory on Jingoism | 122 |
| The Debate on the "Indian Budget": Opinions of the Press | 122 |
| Advertisements ... | 124 |


*_* *During the Parliamentary recess* INDIA *will consist of 12 pages weekly, subject to occasional enlargement if necessary.*

## NOTES AND NEWS.

A MEMORIAL praying for the remission of the unexpired part of Mr. Tilak's sentence was submitted to her Majesty the Queen, Empress of India, in May last. It was signed by the Right Hon. Professor Max Müller, the Right Hon. Sir Richard Garth, Sir William Hunter, and many others. It is now reported that in June Mr. Tilak was visited in prison by Mr. Nugent, Member of the Bombay Council, but what the purpose of the visit was is not publicly known. "Very likely," says a Bombay correspondent of the *Hindu*, "what I wrote to you some weeks before will happen. Mr. Tilak will probably be given the benefit of the rule framed last year, authorising gaol authorities to recommend for release any prisoner whose unexpired sentence is within six months, and whose conduct is considered deserving of such indulgence." The *Mahratta*, however, states that "the immediate result of this interview has been the deprivation of the indulgence which the unfortunate man had of seeing his relations once a month instead of three months' allowed by the rules." One can only hope that this statement is due to misapprehension.

One is not surprised that there should be bitter disappointment in India at the attitude of the Liberal Front Bench towards the present policy of repression. Rightly or wrongly suspicion falls on the Liberal statesman to whom the people of India had a right to look for sympathy and help in these times. The *Madras Standard*, a temperate and representative journal, writes as follows in a passage which, whatever may be thought of it here, is undoubtedly typical of a good deal of Indian opinion:—

Lord George Hamilton could not have pursued this reactionary policy, had it not been for the support he has been invariably receiving from his immediate predecessor in office. It is Sir Henry Fowler that is helping him on. The quiet statesmanship of Lord Kimberley and the commanding authority and personality of the late Mr. Gladstone put some spirit into Congressmen; and it was at this time that the resolution on the Simultaneous Civil Service examinations was carried in the House of Commons in the teeth of the opposition of the Government of the day. But before the whole controversy was to be closed, there was a re-shuffling of the ministerial cards. Mr. Gladstone's personality was withdrawn from public life, and Sir Henry Fowler stepped into the shoes of Lord Kimberley, who became Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in Lord Rosebery's Government. The misfortunes of the Congress, if misfortunes they be, date from Sir Henry Fowler's assumption of office. When he entered office, great things were expected of him. He rose from the ranks, and was regarded as a Radical statesman of enterprising genius. But the charms of office converted him into a Tory of Tories—an uncompromising defender of everything that exists, and an inveterate opponent of reforms and changes.

It is refreshing in these days of coercion in India to read of English administrators who can still trust the people, and feel for them that sympathy which distinguished the early builders of the Empire like Munro, Elphinstone, and Bentinck. Sir Antony MacDonnell is such an one, and his *locum tenens*, Mr. La Touche, is plainly walking in his footsteps. His promotion to one of the highest offices open to Indian civilians has not damped but deepened his regard for the people. The Lucknow *Advocate* mentions that while he was recently at Benares, he visited a learned devotee of that sacred town. The incident itself is trifling. But the sympathy which inspires such acts has its effect upon the loyalty of India, which Press prosecutions cannot promote, and the law of sedition will not secure. With how little wisdom is the world governed, is an old remark. Recent events in India suggest a stronger reflexion. What unspeakable folly must inspire those who think they can maintain the empire of India or the loyalty of the people by repression!

We beg to draw the attention of our readers to the valuable letter (printed at page 121 of our present issue) by Mr. Gupta, editor of the *Lahore Tribune*, upon the behaviour of the police at Garshankar.

The last number of the *Mahratta* to hand informs us that the fate of the Poona Municipality has been determined. The Poona Municipality was established in 1855. From that date to 1883 the municipal committee consisted of 36 members, all nominated by the Government. In 1883 the number of the municipal commissioners was reduced to 28, and 12 of these—nearly one-half—were elected. The elective system worked well, and in 1885 Poona received its present constitution under which there are 30 members, two-thirds of whom are elected. For thirteen years this constitution has given satisfaction, and it has been proved that the elected commissioners are more regular in their attendance, and more attentive to their business than the nominated Commissioners. But a strong Tory reaction has now set in. The imperfect sanitary condition of the town, due to its poverty, is falsely laid at the door of the elective system, and it is now proposed to increase the number of nominated commissioners to 15, the number of elected commissioners remaining as it is.

The supporters of the "forward" policy seem to have some difficulty in agreeing on the arguments by which it is to be defended. Lord Roberts, in his speech in Parliament last April, declared that our advances beyond the frontier were "necessitated by the incontrovertible fact that a great European Power is now within striking distance of our Indian possessions, and in immediate contact with a State for the integrity of which we have made ourselves responsible." Whatever may be said for the second part of this argument, the first can scarcely pass muster. Indeed, another eminent advocate of the "forward" policy, Sir Bindon Blood, has recently pointed out that as at least 150,000 men would be necessary, who would have to be supplied during their long march across Afghanistan, "the operation cannot be done." In the Chitral expedition it took 23,000 animals to move 15,000 men. In the Tirah campaign 70,000 or 80,000 beasts were required. What an incalculable number would be needed to bring 150,000 men across Afghanistan! How, then, as the *Pioneer* asks, can Russia be said to be "within striking distance" of India? The answer has of course been supplied in great detail, and with irresistible force, by Colonel Hanna.

The refusal of the present Government to throw upon the home treasury any portion of the cost of the war beyond the Indian frontier, and its readiness to contribute to the cost of the Egyptian campaign, have naturally excited remark in India. India, says the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, is a part of the British Empire: Egypt is not. India is all but bankrupt: Egypt is fairly well off. India's frontier war is England's against Russia: Egypt's frontier war is Egypt's own. Yet England makes a contribution to Egypt, and none to India. "This sort of glaring injustice goes deep into the heart, and creates more sedition in the country than any amount of writing in the so-called seditious newspapers of India. The ministry refused help to India on the ground that her financial prospects have improved. How is it then that a loan of ten millions has been contracted to meet her needs?"

The *Hindu*, in an article on rural sanitation, points out some real difficulties. The Madras Presidency includes nearly 57,000 villages, more than a third of which contain populations exceeding 500. In other words, there are some 20,000 villages with populations varying from 500 to 2,000. Where is the money to effect the necessary sanitary improvements? All talk about introducing sanitary reforms is idle until the Government is prepared to meet the cost, in its two-fold capacity as State and as landlord. The indispensable reforms are (1) drainage, and (2) supply of good drinking water. An annual expenditure of half a million in each Province, or three millions in all India, might change the face of the country in one decade. But where is the strong and just administrator who will cut down useless military expenditure, and devote three millions a year to drainage and the stricken population of India?

---

News of another shooting case comes by the mail from India. Chinnasawmy, an Indian boy of sixteen, was riding in a jutka, by which Private Knight was returning from Poonamallee to Secunderabad. Near Avadi, the boy was found lying on the road, wounded, and he has since died. According to Knight's account, he was having an argument with the driver on some question of shooting when his gun went off accidentally. The boy jumped off, and as they did not know that he was wounded, they did not stop. The jury brought in a verdict that death resulted from "a rash and negligent act," and the Anglo-Indian journal, the *Madras Mail*, declares "no words too strong to describe the reckless foolhardiness" of Knight's conduct. It also hopes that, in addition to the "much more serious investigation" by the civil power which will follow the coroner's inquest, the military authorities will enquire how it was that Private Knight was in possession of twenty rounds of ball ammunition. This is pretty obviously the case to which our Madras correspondent referred in the telegram printed in our issue of last week.

---

An Indian correspondent writes:—"A story is often told that when the Prince of Wales was in India, his Royal Highness was shocked at the conduct of some Europeans towards a Native crowd in Agra. His Royal Highness is said to have repeated what he had seen to her Majesty the Queen, and the most illustrious lady in the land, who has never lacked in personal sympathy for her Indian subjects, gave expression to those noble sentiments which were promulgated in the famous Fuller minute of Lord Lytton. If it were possible to impress on every Englishman and every Englishwoman who goes to India the sentiments which Lord Lytton tried to promulgate in India—probably under royal inspiration—and if it were also possible to impress on Anglo-Indian newspapers in India some degree of respect for their Indian fellow-subjects, sedition laws and Press prosecutions would be needless, and the Empire of India would be based on the affections of a grateful nation."

---

The Bombay Presidency Association, among other bodies, protested against the new rules by which natives of pure Asiatic descent from Bombay, Madras and Bengal were excluded from admission into the Thomason College at Rurkee to qualify themselves as engineers. The Government has at last vouchsafed a reply to the protest and explained that the natives of Bombay, Madras, and Bengal may educate themselves in the Colleges in their own Provinces and serve in their own Provinces. This is a mere blind. It is well known that the provincial engineering Colleges, like the Shibpur College near Calcutta, do not afford a training equal to that of Rurkee, and that the higher appointments in the engineering service are filled by men trained at the Rurkee College or at Cooper's Hill. A telegram in the *Pioneer* illustrates the effect of the new rules. There were, it seems, nine men admitted into Rurkee College this year, of whom seven were Europeans and only two native Indians. "Is the Public Works Department," asks an Indian paper, "going to be gradually reserved for boys of the ruling race and their Asiatic blood-relations, like the Salt, Opium, and Imperial Telegraph Departments?" Apparently it is.

An India correspondent writes:—In the debate on higher education, on August 11, Mr. Robinson Souttar paid Sir M. Bhownaggree an unmerited compliment when he said that "it was not an edifying thing for a man to kick down the ladder by which he had climbed to fame." Sir M. Bhownaggree, unless I am greatly mistaken, has never climbed that ladder of higher education, unless indeed the phrase be applicable to one who has merely succeeded in matriculating in the University of Bombay. In that achievement Sir M. Bhownaggree has, I believe, succeeded. But he has no knowledge nor experience of University culture, and is therefore hardly competent to express a valuable opinion upon the matter. Yet the House of Commons, we are used to believe, expects in those who profess to instruct it upon any subject some personal knowledge of what they are talking about. It is true, I believe, that Sir M. Bhownaggree has been called to the Bar. But the educational tests which are imposed upon candidates for the Bar can hardly be said to impose a stupendous strain upon the faculties, and nobody will seriously contend that the mere *status* of barrister-at-law makes a man a competent authority upon the effects and value of higher education. Sir M. Bhownaggree, with the modesty which so pleasantly distinguishes him, appears to have assured the House of Commons that "he was himself a product of that education." One can only wish that he were; for then he might form a true estimate of the importance—or, rather, the absolute necessity—of higher education in India, and might himself do some credit to what educated Indians believe to be one of the greatest blessings conferred by England upon India, one, too, which in blessing India has at the same time been fruitful in advantage to England herself.

---

Two questions of some importance are before Bombay University. The first is as to the recognition of vernacular languages in the University examinations. Mr. Justice Ranade has shown the progress which has been made in the development of vernacular literatures within the last thirty years, and pleads for their recognition. The *Hindi Punch*, we see, has a capital cartoon in which the "humble sisters" (Marathi and Gujarati) plead their cause before "the proud lady" (the University), asking not to be spurned. The other question has to do with a proposal to enable candidates to pass the University examinations by compartments. The senate of the University appears to have adopted a proposal in favour of a scheme of this kind, and to have addressed a letter to the Government upon the matter. But it is, we imagine, doubtful whether the Government will concede what the senate asks.

---

The Simla correspondent of the *Times* telegraphed some time ago what purported to be a translation from a vernacular paper, the *Hindustani*, of some comments on the native Indian character. The Lucknow *Advocate* now declares that the translation was garbled, and did not convey the sense of the original. "Out of this three-column article," says the *Advocate*, "some twenty lines extracted, some from here, some from there, were republished in the *Pioneer*. There were several inaccuracies in the translation and import. But we do not take any notice of those innocent inaccuracies. Our political opponents, however, took rather a mean advantage of the extract, and the Simla correspondent of the London *Times* went to the length of writing a portion of that paragraph to that journal." In this way the British public is informed as to the tone of the Native Indian Press.

---

All those to whom the welfare of the British soldier in India is dear, will find the Annual Report of the Army Temperance Association very interesting reading. It will have been noted how often, in the outrages of English soldiers on Indians, the assailants have been under the influence of liquor; and though if they had not come to look on the Indians as fair game, it is unlikely that their drunken frolics would have taken so dangerous a direction, it is still true that, had they remained sober, their evil thoughts might never have been translated into such dastardly actions. As regards crime in the Army it is found that the convictions of abstainers by court martial are only 5·07 per thousand, while those of non-abstainers are 34·34, the summary convictions being 36·52 and 74·43 respectively; and though this may only show that it is the steadier men who join the Association, the figures are very remarkable. It may seem ungenerous to criticise a detail in such excellent work, but is it not rather absurd that men should lose their membership because when on active

service, they drank the rum issued under medical authority?

But the *direct* promotion of temperance is not the only work of the Association. The difficulties and temptations that beset young men under the best circumstances are aggravated in India by the enervating climate and by the absence of the restraining influences of home and family and old associations. The life, too, becomes monotonous when the first novelty has worn off. It is in fighting this dull monotony—the fruitful parent of evil—that perhaps the best work is done. That the soldiers look on this as the chief function of the Association is obvious, for when some of the temperance rooms were closed as a consequence of the frontier war, many of the younger members retired. Entertainments and games are most excellent arguments. Colonel Fitzherbert says of the room at Deodali, "With a bagatelle table, numerous games and papers, excellent pictures on the walls, and well-lighted, it is an ideal temperance room." All this seems to have but an indirect relation to temperance, but it is none the worse for that.

The indefatigable *Champion* continues its examination of the financial results of railways in India. Paragraph 19 of the Administration Report for the year 1897-98 clearly sets forth the losses of that year, and the total loss of Rs. 1,63,40,000 is thus made up.

| Losses, 1897-98. | Rs. |
|---|---|
| Guaranteed Railways .. .. .. .. | 1,32,75,000 |
| State Railways, Military, open .. .. .. | 52,26,000 |
| ,, ,, not open .. .. | 6,96,300 |
| ,, Commercial, open .. .. | 13,45,000 |
| ,, ,, not open .. .. | 15,26,700 |
| | 2,20,69,000 |
| **Gains, 1897-98.** | |
| State lines leased to companies .. .. .. | 89,29,000 |
| ,, worked by companies .. .. | 1,62,88,000 |
| Gain .. | 73,59,000 |
| Apparent Net Loss .. .. .. .. | 1,47,10,000 |
| Add Indirect Charges .. .. .. .. | 16,30,000 |
| Total Apparent Charge .. .. .. .. | 1,63,40,000 |

The report of the Famine Commission is awaited with some anxiety. To judge from the experience of past Commissions little practical good can be expected from it. The real cause of the misery and indebtedness of the Indian agriculturist is sufficiently well known to those who have ears to hear, and the remedy is simple if the Government had the courage and wisdom to adopt it. There is no higher authority on the subject than the late Sir James Caird, and he was of opinion, after independent enquiry, that the Indian peasant had been made the scapegoat of the erroneous economic policy of the State during half a century; that the revenue assessments were exacting; and that the rents should be lightened. Honestly to adopt this policy—which of course would involve the abandonment of some military crazes—would do more good to the millions of Indian cultivators than reams of reports written by the ablest Famine Commissions.

The current issue of *British Indian Commerce* contains the following letter from Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji to the editor: In your first number of *British-Indian Commerce* of 1st inst., which I read with interest, there are two thumping statements. (1) Some bright genius has made the discovery that Council Bills are "imports" into India. There is a saying, I think, "that there is no ill-wind but it does good to somebody." Sc, I suppose, the respectable gentry who put their hands into people's pockets may now well justify their action by this discovery. They may say that when we put our hands in anybody's pockets we should not be understood as taking out money or anything but making "imports" into the pocket, just as the Council Bills, by which the India Office draws money into this country from the revenues or pockets of India, are not to be understood as doing any such thing, but as that the India Office makes "imports" into India by these Bills. (2) Sir Howard Vincent, M.P., tells us that the British Indian vast Empire "has cost millions upon millions of British treasure." This, I suppose, is so, because as a matter of fact both the formation and maintenance of this Empire has *not* cost a single shilling of British treasure, but that, on the contrary, India has been forced to pay not only every shilling of that cost, but to pay thousands of millions besides to England as a "cruel and crushing tribute." Sir Howard Vincent further adds—"Rivers upon rivers of British blood." This, I suppose, is also true, because it is by far the larger portion of the blood of the *Indians* which has formed the British Indian Empire, still maintains it, preserves it, and extends the British Empire in other parts of the world—and all this with what result? The reward—that the Indians are kept under heel as a helotry under an un-British despotic rule! Will such gentlemen ever have some sense of gratitude, and even of some self-respect and true self-interest?

In the August number of the *Madras Review*, Mr. Justice Ranade gives an account of the second great crisis in Maratha history, when, after the death of Shivaji, Aurungzeb invaded the Deccan with all the power of his mighty empire. The Marathas gave way, but only for the moment. While bands of partisans harassed the enemy, Rajaram, Shivaji's second son, retreated to the south, and threw himself into the fortress of Gingi, and the years spent by the Moguls in besieging it gave his nation the breathing space that was wanted. It was this twenty years' war of independence that consolidated the Maratha nation and enabled it to play so great a part in Indian history.

From a recent prosecution it would seem to be dangerous to praise Shivaji, but perhaps that in a judge is but a choleric word which in an editor's flat blasphemy. At all events Mr. Justice Ranade says that Rajaram "inherited most of the great qualities of his father—his daring and his skill, his freedom from vice, and the mildness and liberality of his disposition, and, above all, his power of inspiring confidence among his countrymen." Nor does the Judge accept the common view that the Marathas were only plunderers:—

Mere freebooters and plunderers never could have obtained success in such a war against such a foe. It was a higher moral force which brought out all the virtues of the best men of the nation—daring heroism, noble endurance, administrative skill, hope which rose higher with every disappointment, a faith which was never shaken, devotion to a high ideal which was independent of time, place, or person, a sense of brotherhood in common danger, a spirit of complete self-sacrifice and mutual concession for the common good, a trust in the final success of their cause, because it was the cause of their religion.

It is not so many weeks ago that to doubt the existence of plague in Calcutta was a sign of a disaffected spirit, while to find fault with the means adopted to check its course was looked upon as rank sedition. And now Mr. Yule, the chairman of the Bank of Calcutta, is found taking up both these positions in his address to the shareholders of that institution. After adverting to the flight of nearly one-fourth of the inhabitants, the dislocation of business, the troubles between masters and men, and the other evils of that wretched time, he went on to say:—

The panic itself has happily subsided and the people are now no longer afraid of the disease, which many of them believe to be a kind of fever attended by swellings arising from weakness, which is not uncommon in Bengal during the monsoon months. In any case, plague is not the term to apply to an ailment which has not, except in less than a dozen cases, attacked two people in the same house or confined itself to any particular part of the town. The word more fittingly describes the state of misery into which many thousands of our poorer citizens were thrown, by their eagerness to escape from the dreaded inoculator and the municipal plague hospital. The mischief has been done and it is impossible to recall the past, but this black page in Calcutta's history teaches that the Government cannot too fully take the people into their confidence before adopting any measure which interferes with caste regulations and the happiness and liberty of the subject.

In these last words, it seems to us, Mr. Yule has pointed the moral of all the recent troubles in India.

Elsewhere in our present issue will be found a series of extracts from English newspapers upon the recent debate on the "Indian Budget." Nothing could well be better than the remarks of some of the Liberal journals, and nothing more silly than the remarks of some of their Tory contemporaries. How educated Indians are to be conciliated by a mixture of scorn and misrepresentation we quite fail to perceive. Tories who insist that Indian questions must not be treated as party questions should take note of these things.

## SIR HENRY LAWRENCE.[1]

IN an age when a policy of frontier extension finds favour in high places, and when rulers and ruled are separated by a growing distrust and suspicion, it is a pleasure to read this clear and impartial biography of an Anglo-Indian statesman who was at once the friend and protector of those whom he governed, and the steadfast opponent of all double-dealing and aggression. Those who claim for the people of India a share in the government of their country are now too often treated as traitors or dupes. But no one will dare to make such accusations against Henry Lawrence. By his administration he brought peace and contentment to the Sikhs; by his policy he quieted the fears of the independent sovereigns of Rajputana; by his government he won the hearts of chiefs and people in Oudh, and on the outbreak of the great Mutiny, which he was the first to foresee, the Rajput princes refused to join the mutineers, the soldiers of the Punjab came willingly to our aid, and the successful defence of Lucknow, which was only possible to a ruler beloved by the people, checked the progress of the rebellion, and in the end led to the fall of Delhi. In time of peace the firm protector of the Indians, in the hour of calamity the most ready and valiant of the servants of the Government, he in every way carried out the words which at his own wish were placed on his honoured tomb: "Here lies Henry Lawrence, who tried to do his duty." Nor was that duty less faithfully discharged when he was engaged in winning the love and confidence of his Indian fellow-subjects, than when he died the hero and the victim of the defence of the Lucknow Residency.

Sir Henry Lawrence has long been considered the most eminent type of a school of statesmen—now, alas, less powerful than they once were—who were united in opposing aggression beyond the frontiers, in protecting the existing Native States, and in carrying on the administration in such a way as to ensure the friendliness and co-operation of the people. It was Sir Henry's view that the Punjab with its martial inhabitants was of far more use to us as a buffer protecting our territory from the lawless tribes beyond, than it could be as a province of the Indian Empire. In his own words:—

> It has ever been the wish of the British Government to assist in the maintenance of a strong Sikh Government in the Punjab. It is understood that those who had the best means of forming a judgment on this question, in whatever other points they may have differed, were all agreed in this, that no advantage that might be gained by annexation could equal that of having an independent and warlike but friendly people between us and the loose, wild, Mahometan hordes of Central Asia.

He saw, too, the objection that arises to the "forward" policy from its great cost. Thus, on a proposal to annex Kashmir, then at a considerable distance from British territory, he says:—

> A position so isolated and difficult of access could only have been held by means of a chain of strong military posts. The ruinous expense of such a measure is the most conclusive argument against it.

But such considerations apparently have less effect on the present rulers of India. We have, as Lawrence foretold, found the wild tribes very troublesome neighbours. We are, it seems, bent on making them our enemies by attempts at conquest, when we might make them our defenders; and even if we succeeded in mastering them, it would only be to find new dangers beyond. But signs are not wanting that in face of the troubles brought on by the new policy, many Anglo-Indians are inclined to return to the views of Lawrence.

His biographer thus characterises the statesmen who held these views:—

> This school, which gave special consideration to the feelings, traditions and modes of thought of the Native community, demanded a fair recognition of the claims of Native States, and urged the need for wise and generous treatment of the natural leaders of the people and the influential classes, fallen into an unsatisfactory state after ages of war and turmoil. They also advocated the policy of continuing in a large measure the independence, under British protection, of Natives States and Dynasties, and of educating their rulers for their position and guiding them in the discharge of their high functions.

It was Lawrence's hope that he might aid in securing for the Punjab this union of justice and moderation with (in Lord Hardinge's words) "an administration conducted by Native executive agency in accordance with the customs and feelings and even prejudices of the people." But this was not to be. Lord Dalhousie had different ideas. Lawrence always believed that the Viceroy refrained from at once destroying the revolt of the Governor of Multan, who was not a Sikh, because that revolt would furnish a pretext for destroying the independence of the Punjab, though the Sikh leaders had not countenanced the outbreak, and though their inability to control the soldiery had been the reason for making Lawrence the virtual ruler of the country during the minority of Dhuleep Singh. Sir Henry Lawrence was favoured and promoted by five Viceroys—Bentinck, Auckland, Ellenborough, Hardinge, and Canning. Perhaps it was a still greater honour to him that he was repressed by Lord Dalhousie.

In Rajputana he was more successful. It seemed to be Lord Dalhousie's policy, by refusing to recognise adoption, to gain possession of each Rajput State to which there was no direct heir—and this had led to widespread discontent. Lawrence obtained the recognition of adoption under certain restrictions, and all fears were quieted. But it was not till the outbreak of the Mutiny that it was seen how much had thus been gained.

Though Lawrence was the great opponent of annexation, it was perhaps in avoiding its worst results and in reconciling the conquered to our rule that his best work was done, first in the Punjab and afterwards in Oudh. He had a genius for understanding the Indians and winning their confidence. But the real explanation of his success is to be found in the soundness of his general views and his great love for the Indian people. Thus he says, just before the outbreak of the Mutiny:—

> We measure too much by English rules, and expect, contrary to all experience, that the energetic and aspiring among immense military masses should like our dead level and our arrogation to ourselves, even where we are notorious imbeciles, of all authority and all emolument. These sentiments of mine, freely expressed during the last fifteen years, have done me injury, but I am not less convinced of their soundness, and that until we treat Natives, and especially Native soldiers, as having much the same feelings, the same ambition, the same perception of ability and imbecility as ourselves, we shall never be safe.

In early life, while he was engaged in the Revenue Survey, he had gained much knowledge of the people.

> More than all he became permanently impressed with the keenness of their traditional feelings, and with the conviction that to govern India well and successfully it was essential to secure the confidence of the people and keep in touch with their modes of thought and feeling. He was keenly alive to the folly of despising or ignoring their mental powers, and their insight into the causes, bearings, and results of the actions and measures of the State; and of assuming that their views in these matters were to be disregarded. His tolerant mind condemned the prejudice which the arrogant Englishman was apt to form against the Native, and the tendency to assume that English standards of conduct and of policy should alone be used to judge Native action and attitude towards British rule.

Thus admirably adapted to bring out all the good and to repress all the evil of British Government, Lawrence the Pacificator lives in history as the best and wisest type of the Anglo-Indian ruler, revered by his countrymen for his services to the State, remembered by the Indians as the firm and sagacious friend of India. A noble life and a fit reward!

[1] "Sir Henry Lawrence, the Pacificator." By Lieut.-General J. J. McLeod Innes, R.E., V.C. (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1898. 3s. 6d.)

---

## INDIA SEEN THROUGH OFFICIAL SPECTACLES.[1]

By E. H. Pickersgill, M.P.

WE are informed in the Annual Report upon which this article is based that pessimism is one of the characteristic traits of Bengali journalism. If it is so, this quality has probably been developed in the Bengali journalist by way of reaction against the inveterate optimism of Anglo-Indian officials. In perusing the publications which are issued from the India Office, an intelligent reader must feel that, while the official version of the story is no doubt true so far as it goes, there is another side. Hence the Press, which supplies the complement and sometimes the corrective of the official view, performs an eminently useful function, and one which is truly loyal to the best interests alike of England and of India.

The very first page of this Report, which gives a list of the *personnel* of the Administration, recalls to the mind of

[1] "Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India during the year 1896-7. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 28 July, 1898."

the reformer a suggestion the realisation of which has long been overdue. I refer to the amendment of the constitution of the India Council in London. This body, which was established to assist the Secretary of State in controlling the Government of India, is limited to 15 members, and is composed of ex-Anglo-Indian officials. The Council thus consists of persons who are no doubt in a sense experts in Indian affairs; but they are for the most part men in the decline of life, whose experiences of India may have been derived from a period long gone by, and who not unnaturally cling to the systems and methods under which they themselves worked in that country. It is not likely that a body so constituted will be receptive of new ideas or friendly to reforms; and, in fact, the action of the Council of India has often been very mischievous. It was the Council of India which killed Sir William Wedderburn's pioneer project for the establishment of Agricultural Banks; it was the Council of India which hampered Lord Ripon's efforts to ameliorate the condition of the cultivators in Oudh; and it was the Council of India which within the last twelve months compelled the Viceroy against his better judgment to alter the substantive law of sedition. In these circumstances a reform in the constitution of the Council is urgently needed. Failing a more drastic measure, at least some Indian blood should be introduced. The admission to the Council of a few distinguished Indian statesmen, if only they were rightly selected, would, I believe, in the present state of feeling in India produce an excellent effect. I am disposed to think that next Session the question might be usefully raised in Parliament, and that a strong effort should be made to get something done in the direction indicated.

A considerable number of important Acts were passed during the year under review, but practically there was no agrarian legislation. The Decennial Statement issued a few years ago showed that in some provinces the land, to a very serious extent, was passing either into the hands, or at all events under the control, of money-lenders. In the Punjab alone within a decade over two million acres had been sold or mortgaged to *non-agriculturists*, of whom the vast majority, it is to be feared, belonged to the money-lending class. In the year under review, however, the report respecting the Punjab upon this head is that "the excess of area mortgaged over area redeemed was 195,000 acres, or less than in any year, except 1891, during the last nine years. The area under mortgage at the end of the year was 4,773,000 acres, or 8⅓ per cent. of the total of proprietary lands; the area mortgaged and sold has decreased during recent years, while the area redeemed from mortgage has increased." As regards Bengal, it is stated that "the number of registered transfers of holdings by rayats, paying at fixed rates or enjoying occupancy rights, rose from 195,203 in 1895-6 to 226,071 in 1896-7; the transfer was made in 158,433 cases to other rayats, and in 26,051 cases to money-lenders." A curious and very interesting case is reported to have occurred at Midnapur. "The rayats of a landholder"—we are told—"have arranged to subscribe to pay off his debts, and are doing so regularly, depositing the money with the Subdivisional Officer in his private capacity. The proprietor is of an ancient family, and the tenants are anxious to support him, so as not to fall under a new proprietor with modern ideas of management." In Madras there was a considerable decrease in the number of documents registered in 1896-7 as compared with the previous year, and this decrease is attributed in part to "a new plan—adopted by local money-lenders—of advancing money on notes of hand, written on one-anna stamped paper, and unregistered."

In the Report on the last Indian Census it was pointed out that the proportion of money-lenders who combined that occupation with the possession of land, was far greater in the British territory than in Native States. The reason was not far to seek. It was the old story—the ruthless introduction of English law without regard to local conditions and ancient custom. We had made the land in our territory liable as the ultimate security for all the obligations of its possessor, whether it had been specifically pledged or not, and the luckless debtor could be "sold up" under the provisions of the Civil Procedure Code. In the Native States, on the other hand, alienation (if not prohibited) was hampered and restricted at every turn by custom and tradition. As a Punjab landlord once pithily put the case, "In a Native State law is the salt, but in British districts it is the whole banquet." Palliatives have had to be introduced in various forms in different Provinces, but the most extensive measure as yet in operation is the Deccan Agricultural Relief Act of 1879. This Act, with its amending Acts, affords to agriculturists equitable relief from extortionate bargains. In 1892 a Commission reported favourably on the working of these Acts, and recommended that their provisions should be extended to other Provinces. So far, however, nothing has actually been done in this direction. But we were assured by Lord George Hamilton in June last that Lord Elgin had "collected all the materials necessary for agrarian legislation, which would greatly improve the condition of the tillers and occupiers of the soil." Here, then, is a great opportunity for Mr. Curzon, like another Solomon, to build himself an everlasting name with the materials kindly provided by his great predecessor.

The interest attaching to the information with respect to the famine contained in this Report has been for the most part anticipated by the statement which Lord George Hamilton made in the House of Commons. But there are some facts which, I think, are new. For instance, we are told that "at one time 42 per cent. of the total population were receiving daily relief in the Banda district; *this is a proportion much beyond what was known in any previous famine*" (the italics are mine). It is also stated that "in the North-West Provinces the local government estimates the deficiency in food grains alone, valued at normal prices, to have been Rx. 34½ millions." The statement in the Report that "the famine of 1896-7 will probably have caused a permanent loss of not less than Rx. 14 millions to the Indian Treasury" may be compared or contrasted with the statement made by Lord George Hamilton in Parliament on June 7 that "for the year 1896-7 the total direct and indirect loss caused to the Indian Exchequer by the famine was Rx. 7,514,312." As regards the plague, the Report states that "the expenditure incurred from general, municipal, and local revenue, in combating the plague, will probably reach Rx. 500,000 by the middle of 1898; in Bombay city alone the municipal authorities anticipate that Rx. 300,000 will have been spent." I am afraid that this estimate will prove to be very considerably under the mark. Readers of the Parliamentary reports published in INDIA during the Session will have noticed some references to "strained relations" between our Resident at Hyderabad and the Nizam, respecting which the Secretary of State was suspiciously reticent. The following paragraph in the "Statement" throws some light upon this subject:—

"The finances of the Hyderabad State, as well as those of the Hyderabad Assigned Districts, suffered from the general scarcity. The decline of the surplus received by the Nizam's Government from the Assigned Districts, combined with a steady increase in the personal and household expenditure of the Nizam, have resulted in severe financial embarrassments. An officer lent by the Financial Department of the Government of India was, at the end of the year under review, appointed to make an examination into the financial position of the State. The total revenues amount to about 4 crores, and there has been a tendency during recent years for the expenditure to exceed this amount."

I have by no means exhausted the interesting topics which are suggested by the Annual Report under review. But the rest I must leave over for another occasion.

## THE COLLAPSE OF THE "JERRY-BUILDINGS."

BY AN ANGLO-INDIAN.

ANGLO-INDIANS of all shades of opinion and our public men of all parties—with the possible exception of Lord Roberts and the Hon. George Curzon—recognise that the trans-frontier policy is utterly discredited and broken up. Or, to take another way of describing the situation, the combustible material inherent in that policy has caused it to perish in its own conflagration, ignited in the first instance by Sir Henry Fowler's own lucifer match, and breaking out into sudden blaze in the purifying fire at Simla, for which wholesome purpose Mr. Commissioner Thorburn was the brave torch-bearer. This reflection should serve to console Mr. Thorburn for his enforced apology, which, be it noted, contained no line of withdrawal. That passage in his Simla speech—

Our policy of extending the frontier is intolerable to the tribesmen

and impossible for ourselves, on account of its hopeless expense and its utter want of finality

—will stand as marking the return of the devastating tide. The last wave of that rose with the invasion of Waziristan in 1893-4, culminated with the Malakand-Chakdara expedition, and subsided with the retreat from Tirah-Maidan.

But it is of one of the large details of this fatal policy that we have to speak just now. Each of its advocates still strives to save his own favourite portion of the vast "jerry-buildings" beyond the frontier. The most imposing of these lath-and-plaster constructions has been the much boasted "Sandeman" structure, so dexterously whitewashed and gilded in Mr. T. H. Thornton's biography of that clever and energetic officer. Some weeks ago a well-known Political from Peshawar, now at home on furlough, one long familiar with the Khyber and the Afridis who are really on our border, was drawn, by some eager interviewer, into casual expression in favour of "the Baluchistan system." To this *obiter dictum* a reply recently appeared in the *Times of India*, signed "Wakif," from one who is evidently a much more experienced Political Officer. This is at once so concise, so incisive, and comprehensive that it may be reproduced here as a permanent record and test statement regarding the least disreputable portion of the whole trans-frontier schemes. Here is this sagacious officer's brief review of a large, much lauded, but baneful episode in modern Indian history:—

I see that, when lately interviewed at home, Colonel Sir Robert Warburton advocated applying to the Punjab frontier and its tribes what he called the "Baluchistan system." There is nothing new in this suggestion, but there is one point in it which seems to me particularly worth bringing out. The term "Baluchistan" is apt to be misleading. The Baluchistan Agency comprises extensive tracts inhabited by Baluch and Brahui tribes, and also several districts, notably Peshin and Zhob, touching the Afghan border, which are not in the least Baluch, but are entirely Pathan. What has been the result, as a matter of fact, of applying the "Baluchistan system" to the *Pathan* districts in the Baluchistan Agency? The answer is *annexation*, either (*a*) technically complete, as in the case of Peshin, or (*b*) practically complete, as in the case of Zhob.

Sir Robert Warburton is also reported to have said that the "Baluchistan system" would answer well on the Punjab frontier, if it were only worked by competent political officers, knowing Pashtu and Pathans. The importance of these qualifications for officers on the frontier is obvious; but it may fairly be contended that the "Baluchistan system" owes much of its success (in effecting the annexation of Pathan districts) to the strong position and garrison at Quetta, and to the weaker garrisons at Loralai, Fort Sandeman, Peshin and Chaman.

There is no magic or mystery about the "Baluchistan system." It is sound in so far as it is based upon military force and money, plenty of both. It can doubtless be applied to the Pathan countries along the Punjab frontier, *if* the Government of India is prepared to provide large enough garrisons and subsidies for the purpose; and the result of so applying it will be *annexation*, as in the Baluchistan Agency.

Nothing could be more complete and instructive for those who have followed this blundering policy from the first transgressions of the frontier at their inception in 1875-6 —and no others can rightly realise what this revolution has meant for India. Here it is much to the point to quote from one who has been an "observer" from and before that parting of the ways—Sir M. E. Grant Duff. In INDIA for July 15 (p. 18) there was a passage from a speech at Elgin in which he said:—"The meaning of the whole series of disastrous blunders which have been made since, twenty years ago [*i.e.*, 1875-6] in defiance of all the best opinions, *we advanced to Quetta*, is simply this, that the soldiers at Simla captured the Civilians, and made more than one Viceroy the prey of their bow and of their spear."

Admirable though this is as an outline of true history, one must remark that it comprises a serious error in political dynamics, one which underlies most of this disastrous story. It was not so much that the "soldiers captured" the Civilian power in India, or that figure-head Viceroys, already under orders from home, succumbed to the trans-frontier conspirators of the period, as that the incitement, in some instances blind, weak consent, came from here. The Secretaries of State in Council and the several British Cabinets to which they belonged have been responsible from first to last. Let them look to it. Their authority has irreparably committed the British Treasury to the obligation of making good to India and its peoples the financial results of this infatuated and disastrous policy. The practical problem for our statesmen is, How and when shall this bill be paid?

Let us revert a moment to the luminous exposition by the Political Officer quoted above. As he says, the now exposed Baluchistan system is only "sound in so far as it is based on military power and money—*plenty* of *both*." As to its being "sound," that writer knows that the "soundness" of the Sandeman system consisted of cajolery, bribery, and garrisons in foreign territory. That was its constructive side—"jerry-building" at the best. On its destructive side it involved the obliteration of the Khan of Khelat and other Chiefs, through whom successive Superintendents of the Scinde frontier, experienced Bombay officers, had by dint of their personal influence and prompt control of marauders kept the peace on the border. But, in an evil hour, one without political experience was appointed to that post so that he might have the "sufficient emoluments" he clamoured for. That gave the trans-frontier conspirators their chance. Sandeman and the Punjabis—all ignorant of the local conditions—swept over the border, with the result, as described by "Wakif," of the political and military muddle which dominates what has been surreptitously designated "British Baluchistan," and is only kept going, as he says, with "plenty of military power and money." And thus we have a comprehensive illustration, subject to local variations, of the whole pretentious "jerry-building," which has been going on for twenty years and more in *un*civilised Asia—with scarcely a check from responsible British statesmen—from Khelat on the south over tens of thousands of square miles (with th' legs up'ards) even unto Chitral, Gilghit, and the Pamirs.

This subject of "British Baluchistan" should be made the test of sincerity of authorities who now profess a desire to revise the whole trans-frontier policy. If they really intend this, which we are bound to believe, then they will restore Quetta, Peshin, and Chauman to the Amir, and make the Khan of Khelat again a Chief in his own right, giving him, as before, competent political guidance.

## MORE CURRENCY QUACKERY.[1]

MR. HENRY DUNNING MACLEOD, who occupies a distinctive position among the political economists of the day, and is, indeed, in certain respects, the most distinguished of them all, has just come forward with a remedy for the "monetary crisis of the most momentous gravity," with which the Government of India is now faced. This crisis, according to Mr. MacLeod, "has been brought on by a series of measures showing the grossest ignorance of the rudiments of economics by successive Governments, both Company's and Imperial, which have brought India to the verge of bankruptcy." For all the cheeriness of Lord George Hamilton, and all the make-believe of Sir James Westland, the Government yet profess that the situation is "intolerable." But there is balm in Gilead. There is a remedy: for, says Mr. MacLeod, "the errors of these measures" of former times "are as glaring and blazing as the sun of Calcutta at mid-day." What, then, is the remedy? This: as the present Monetary System of England, founded on the experience of centuries, is the most perfect ever devised by the ingenuity of man, and has been generally adopted elsewhere, "the obvious thing to be done is to bring the Monetary System of India into harmony with that of England and other civilised Governments, and so to improve its commercial relations with the majority of other nations." To demonstrate that this is the true remedy, and to set forth the means of its accomplishment, is the object of Mr. MacLeod's tract on "Indian Currency," just published by Messrs. Longman. There are but three courses open, says Mr. MacLeod, and only one of these is practicable. Bimetallism is abandoned; the reopening of the mints is set aside as "an act of lunacy"; there remains, then, only the gold standard, or, as Mr. MacLeod expresses it, "to restore the ancient gold currency."

Mr. MacLeod devotes a special chapter to the history of gold currency in India. "From time immemorial," he says, "up to January 1, 1853, India had an immense gold currency in circulation." In the last week of 1852 Lord Dalhousie issued a notification that after January 1, 1853, no gold coin of any sort would be received at the public treasuries, thus demonetising gold, and leaving the field

[1] "Indian Currency." By Henry Dunning MacLeod, M.A. London, New York, and Bombay: Longman, Green and Co.

open to silver. "By this astounding *coup de finance*, utterly without precedent in the history of the world, it was estimated that £120,000,000 of gold coin at once disappeared from circulation and was hoarded away." Hence, "all our present monetary troubles in India." In 1864 the general feeling that a disastrous error had been committed united the leading Chambers of Commerce and the principal business men of the country in a demand for the restoration of a gold currency. The proposals, however, took the form of resuscitation of the discredited bimetallism, and were properly quashed by Sir Charles Wood. Mr. MacLeod singles out for just praise the very able report by Mr. Hollingbery in 1875, but the later movements need not be followed here. We can cordially agree with Mr. MacLeod in his conclusion that "the whole of this unhappy India business is an everlasting stigma on British Economic and Financial statesmanship of the nineteenth century."

But the remedy? The first head of Mr. MacLeod's draft scheme is this: "That, in accordance with the universal demands in 1864, in as short a time as can be done, the gold sovereign be declared to be the Standard Gold Unit throughout the British Dominions in India." Under the sixth head, he proposes to limit legal tender in silver "say to £5, or £10—or such figure as the Government on consideration may deem expedient." Now, there need be no hesitation whatever in accepting this view, although hardly in such a sense as Mr. MacLeod intends. Mr. MacLeod appears to look solely to financial considerations, although he alludes to politics by the way. He does not give practical weight to the fact that we are now a whole generation away from 1864, and that to-day the Chambers of Commerce and all sorts of business men are expressing themselves just as strongly in exactly the opposite sense. If the opinion of the people of the country in 1864 was important as an indication for legislation, is not the opinion of their representatives to-day of equal importance? Nay, is it not of decisive importance? If the Government were now to establish the Gold Standard by a stroke of the pen, how would the act differ from the *coup de finance* of Lord Dalhousie? No such monetary regulation can possibly be successful unless it falls in with the particular conditions of the country at the date of its application. And who is more qualified to speak of the propriety of such application than the Chambers of Commerce and the business men of India and of England? On Mr. MacLeod's own principle, his proposal would be condemned without more, except for one saving clause. That clause, which still fails to save the proposal, is, "in as short a time as can be done." We await that time; but we do not expect it to arrive by next post, as Mr. MacLeod appears in fact to do. His proposal, then, is essentially a counsel of violence parallel to Lord Dalhousie's, if not worse; for the rupee worked well enough in the existing conditions, and might by this time have prepared the country for the sovereign, but for the political follies of Indian administration during the past twenty years.

Mr. MacLeod would obtain the fund of gold necessary as a basis for his gold standard by requiring all customs duties to be paid in gold (after a certain date), by attracting the gold produced by the Indian mining companies, and by offering some slight advantage to Indians who will bring their hoarded gold and personal ornaments to the Mint. He imagines that "if the Mints were opened to the free coinage of gold, the alleged hardship caused by closing them to silver would be entirely obviated." But would it be in the least obviated? It is not enough to speculate that the Indians would prefer gold to silver; very likely they might, if they could get it on proper terms. But the whole question is a question of terms; and this leads us to enquire what Mr. MacLeod has to say about the fate of the rupee. He says he would "leave the present rupee currency absolutely untouched." Frankly, we do not understand this. The rupee is now standard; his scheme would necessarily reduce it to token money. But what of the ratio? Mr. MacLeod breaks down at this crucial point. "The fixing of the ratio between the sovereign and the rupee is so profoundly complex a question," he says, "that I do not offer any suggestion respecting it. It must be left to the decision of the Government after full consideration of all the circumstances of the case." But we want our distinguished economists to instruct the Government; there are no circumstances of the case that are hidden from them and revealed only to the Government; and the Governments hitherto, during the century, on Mr. Macleod's own showing, have been reducing the country to bankruptcy by idiotic financial expedients. "There seems," he says, "to be a consensus of opinion among experts that the most advantageous ratio would be to make the rupee equal to 1s. 4d., and 15 rupees to the sovereign." This would be a lovely arrangement. For then "one anna=one penny, ½ anna=one halfpenny, ¼ anna=one farthing, 240 annas=£1," the which "would tend to assimilate the English and Indian monetary systems."

Not a syllable here about the effects upon the industrious and thrifty rayat! True, Mr. MacLeod does not compel the rayat to sell his ornaments. But, at a pinch—and this pinch is the most important thing of all to prevent—the rayat is to bring out his little parcel of savings, and exchange his ornaments at (say) a third less than they cost him. He has saved up £3 in his "savings-bank," and Mr. MacLeod will give him, not merely £2, but "a slight advantage," say £2 0s. 6d. Of course, the case might happen to be the other way about; but it is generally agreed that much the larger portion of the ornaments are of older date than the fall of the rupee. And, on the other hand, let him hold his savings as long as he may, they can never rise above the artificially fixed rate. If, however, the comfortable man of savings or the pinched rayat feel aggrieved, why, let him consider the nice conformity of his country's currency with the Lord Sahib's! Surely that is conclusive to any reasonable man! For, let the Indian take a high constitutional view of the situation. "When governments make changes in the monetary system of a country," Mr. MacLeod will tell him, changes "which they presume to be for the general benefit of the State, they never consider the effects on the interests of private persons. It would be impossible for them to do so." But where is the difference, in this matter, between the rayats and all the other holders of rupees in ornaments on the one hand, and the State on the other? Could any discussion of this great question be more heartlessly disappointing? Mr. MacLeod does not even allude to the real origin of the present movement; he leaves out of real consideration the most important person concerned—the rayat; and he does not deal with the political side of the question. He does not really touch so much as the fringe of the bottom questions on which the whole financial fabric rests. Our most distinguished economist overwhelms all Indian financial experts of the century in a just condemnation of appalling force, and at once projects himself into the same abyss. Heaven help India!

## OUR LONDON LETTER.

(FROM A PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.)

WRITING last week, I dismissed the Session of 1898 as a dull, fruitless, and paltry Session; and so it has been, with regard to legislative achievement. I think men on each side will acknowledge that readily enough. It has sometimes happened, however, that when a Session has produced nothing great in the way of legislation it has been rendered interesting and even memorable by the rise of some new reputation or the collapse of an old one. There is neither one nor the other to report with regard to this year. Indeed, it seems to me that no one has advanced much and no one has fallen back much. It is very generally a case of "as you were" all round. Let me take first the leader of the House, Mr. Balfour. It would be absurd to deny that he keeps his personal hold upon the House. He is still popular and still liked, but I doubt whether his judgment is relied upon more than it used to be. He is generally credited (or should I say discredited?) with having suddenly resolved upon the climb-down on the vaccination question, a piece of tactics which pleased no one and actually induced the House of Lords to raise its heel against a Conservative Government. On the other hand, it is only fair to acknowledge that Mr. Balfour has stuck to his work, and has occupied his place on the Treasury Bench far more than he did in the previous Session.

And that very fact reminds one of another interesting leading character in the House—I mean Mr. Chamberlain. He has certainly not advanced in influence during the Session. He has not had many opportunities, and some-

how or other the hatred of a large section of the Tory party, notorious for long enough to those "in the know," has become open and unconcealed. Moreover, Mr. Chamberlain gave a chance to his enemies by that amazingly inept speech about Russia and "the long spoon." Lord Salisbury and Mr. Curzon both publicly threw him over, and altogether his position can have been anything but a comfortable one of late. It is rumoured persistently that Mr. Chamberlain has been putting out feelers with regard to the formation of a party which he would call "national," but which would have him as its leader. It is said that he would very much like to work in conjunction with Lord Rosebery, but the difficulty is that Mr. Chamberlain would want to lead, and no one can suppose that Lord Rosebery would care to follow. After all it is impossible in politics to leave out of consideration the personal element. Every sensible man recognises Mr. Chamberlain's supreme ability within certain limitations, but outside a certain circle of personal adherents, once caustically described by Mr. Tim Healy as "the retinue," no one likes him. The Tories would never consent to his being placed above Mr. Balfour; nor would the Liberals allow him to oust some of their leaders. It looks, therefore, as though Mr. Chamberlain will never realise his ambition of being the leader of one of the great parties in the State.

While on this subject, perhaps I ought to point out that though Lord Rosebery had consented to stand aside throughout the last Session, no one can suppose that his career is over. On the contrary, it is fairly certain that before the House meets again, he will be put forward by an influential and energetic section of the Liberal party as leader. I express no opinion as to the wisdom of this, but I merely state it as something which must be expected and a development which must be faced. The Irish Nationalist party is not likely to welcome the proposal, for rightly or wrongly Lord Rosebery is supposed to be anything but enthusiastic in the cause of Home Rule. It would be absurd also to pretend that the cry of justice for Ireland rouses the same response in the ranks of the Liberal party generally that it did a few years ago. Here again I abstain from expressing opinions—I merely record a fact which is known and read of all men. Mr. Gladstone's great inspiring personality has been removed, and that together with other causes has led to this result.

I ought perhaps to have referred earlier to Sir William Harcourt. It is becoming fashionable among some Liberals to depreciate Sir William. They say he is not so young as he was, and so on and so forth. Of course, Sir William is getting on in years, but I consider him by far the best fighting man the Liberals have in the House of Commons. He has played a waiting game during the late Session, and I think he was right. He could see that the Tory party is torn by internal dissension. Indeed, by far the strongest condemnation of the Government has come from its "supporters" both in the House and in the Press. In these circumstances Sir William has thought it well to give them rope and leave them to hang themselves. If on the other hand he had brought forward motions of want of confidence and formal party attacks too often, the result would have been to give the Tories something upon which to combine. As it is they have not combined at all, and there has been this notable result—that the Government which, according to the size of its alleged majority, is the strongest of modern times has been in reality one of the weakest. This should to some extent be reckoned to Sir William Harcourt as righteousness. Nor in criticising him should his splendid Budget of 1894 ever be forgotten.

As to other Liberal leaders, I don't think any one of them has made headway. Mr. Asquith is a keen and almost a great debater, but either because of his connexion with the Bar, or from a growing feeling of indifference, he has not been seen much in the House, and when there he has not shown any of that nameless but necessary quality—the gift of inspiring enthusiasm in others. Mr. John Morley, too, a man with many exceptionally fine traits of character, has seen fit to efface himself almost entirely. Everyone knows that Mr. Morley has a hankering after, nay, a passion for the delights of pure literature, and unless there is some great trumpet call to political fighting he is apt to remain away, not sulking in his tent, but busy with other things. Nor have any of the others "made a splash," to use a colloquialism. Indeed, on both sides of politics we have this strange phenomenon. The rank and file are as ready as ever to fight—some of the by-elections have been fought with exceptional vigour—but on neither side is there any great attachment to any particular leader. I suppose it is partly the result of the disappearance of Gladstone. His reputation has dwarfed those who come after him.

And that reminds me that the Session of 1898 will always be memorable in one respect at least, for it was in it that Mr. Gladstone died, and was borne to his fitting resting-place among the great in Westminster Abbey. I shall never forget the wave of feeling which passed through Westminster when the great statesman's death was announced. For after all it was in Parliament that his supreme greatness was chiefly known. He had ceased to be a member of the House for two or three years before his death, but the members always considered him one of themselves to the very end. The influence of his death was distinctly a purifying and elevating influence, and it is only right to say that the Tories joined in the tributes to his memory unreservedly and with sincerity. Of course they had attacked him during life, and that to a good Liberal must appear deplorable; but then they are not Liberals at all, and except when they indulged in personalities their attacks were no doubt from their point of view justifiable. I shall never forget the influence and effect of the great historic scenes when Mr. Gladstone's remains lay in state in Westminster Hall and were afterwards buried in the Abbey. And again, the occasion of the great memorial service in Hyde Park was one to be remembered for ever by those who saw it. The most impressive element in these demonstrations was the fact that they were displays of national as distinguished from party mourning.

I have been led away from my notes on the personalities in the House. Among the younger men two appear to me to have given signs of unusual promise, and the two differ in every way in social position, training, temperament, as well as in political conviction. I refer to Mr. Lloyd George and to Lord Hugh Cecil. The young Welsh member was known before as a very keen debater and a fighter to the backbone. On more than one occasion during the Session he has shown that his reputation is deserved, and he may yet do great things. Lord Hugh Cecil has to contend against the handicapping of ill-health. I do not share any of his views, nay, I cannot understand an intelligent man holding some of them. But it is absurd to deny a man's ability because you do not share his views, and no fair-minded man can watch this pale young lord, delicate almost to the point of being a confirmed invalid, without recognising that he has either genius or something very much like it in him.

## CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

Thursday, August 18.—From Madrid it was reported that Cabinet Councils were being held almost continuously, but were occupied chiefly with matters of secondary importance. Though the Carlists showed no outward signs of activity, the Government maintained an attitude of vigilance towards them, and in Aragon, where they were numerous, their political clubs were being closed. The necessity of radical political reforms to prevent further national disasters was generally recognised.—In the American Press angry comments were still being made on the fact that General Augustin was taken to Hong-kong on a German cruiser.—The question of the Philippines was attracting a good deal of attention in Vienna, where it was thought that American feeling was strengthening in favour of annexation, and was likely to be confirmed by the course of events in China. Rumours that the Washington Government had sounded the Powers on the subject were discredited, because the Americans had already plainly shown that they would not tolerate intervention.

The Bond party in Cape Colony won two seats at Paarl, Sir P. Faure having been beaten by a narrow majority. Mr. Rhodes, speaking at Port Elizabeth, denounced the Independents, who, he said, would end in the arms of the Bond. He should remain south, and if the Cape failed him he would join Natal. It was now estimated that the "Progressive" majority would be under four.

Friday, August 19.—Nearly all the American troops first called into service—from 70,000 to 100,000—were shortly, it was said, to be mustered out. The authorities stated that General Merritt at Manila required no reinforcements at present, and that only a few regiments might have to be sent to Santiago. There was no apprehension that the Cuban insurgents would openly rebel at present against American rule.

—A Madrid journal published some remarks said to have been made by Señor Sagasta, declaring that from a legal point of view the present state of things was neither peace nor war, but merely a suspension of hostilities. The questions to be solved were numerous and complex, both as regards Cuba and the Philippines.—The mysterious departure of General Augustin from Manila in a German warship excited considerable attention in Madrid, and the public were impatient for fuller information.

Earl Grey, in the course of an address delivered to the National Co-operative Festival, said that the character of the Festival was well calculated to impress the popular imagination, and to bring home to the hearts and minds of all co-operators the conviction that the efforts of true co-operation should not be confined to selfish attempts to increase the dividends of a distributive store, but should aim at developing the moral and social side of co-operation. He quoted Kettering and the South Metropolitan Gas Company as instances of what had been accomplished by the movement, and said that the example offered by the action of one million and a half working-men co-operators, in their collective attitude as employers of labour, could not fail to have the greatest influence.

SATURDAY, August 20.—General Merritt's official despatch from Manila made it clear that the surrender included the city and defences of Manila, its suburbs, and the Spanish forces stationed therein, but not the Philippines as a whole. All public property and public funds were to be turned over to the American authorities.—A National Conference, held at Saratoga, with the special view of protesting against the annexation of the Philippines, passed resolutions against returning the conquered islands to Spanish misrule and oppression, and in favour of allowing them to govern themselves when able, and in the meantime to continue under the protection of the United States. —Admiral Sampson's squadron arrived off Sandy Hook this morning, and sailed up the Hudson as far as the tomb of General Grant, where a salute was fired. There was "an immense display of popular enthusiasm."—The Spanish Government appointed its representatives on the Commissions which were to regulate the evacuation of Cuba and Puerto Rico. Much anxiety was felt in Madrid with regard to the Philippines. It was in some quarters supposed that Germany would not allow any great territorial changes in that part of the world without having something to say.

A section of the Liberal Unionists of the Southport division made known their intention to withdraw from support of Lord Skelmersdale, the Conservative candidate. Mr. J. J. Holden, Chairman of the Liberal Unionists, led the defection from the Unionist ranks, and gave as the reason that now Home Rule was not before the country, he, and those who thought with him, were desirous of seeing Liberal measures passed.

MONDAY, August 22.—The *New York Tribune*, which was said to be connected with President M'Kinley, had an article in which the recent utterances of Señor Sagasta were criticised in a menacing tone. It said that if Spain pretended that the agreement to evacuate meant only an agreement to begin talking about the conditions of evacuation, Admiral Sampson's fleet, the refitting of which had been ordered, would soon have something to do. This language, it was thought, might not represent the President's mood; but it did express the resentment aroused by Señor Sagasta's apparent disposition to raise useless points.

Mr. Chamberlain, in a letter to Southport, said he had no hesitation in urging every Liberal Unionist voter to support the candidature of Lord Skelmersdale. To do otherwise would be simply to stultify the policy by the patriotic adoption of which the Liberal Unionists had hitherto succeeded in saving the Empire from disruption.

An intermittent supply of water was begun in the districts supplied by the East London Water Company, and was the cause of considerable inconvenience and public excitement. A special meeting of the General Purposes Committee of the Hackney Vestry was held to consider the subject, and ultimately a sub-committee was appointed to wait on the water company to-morrow.

TUESDAY, August 23.—The first meeting of the International Commission was held in Quebec. Credentials were exchanged, and Lord Herschell was appointed chairman, although the British representatives considered that no presiding officer was necessary. Secretaries having also been appointed, the Commission adjourned. The Commissioners were afterwards welcomed by a meeting of leading citizens of Quebec, and cordial speeches were delivered by Senator Fairbanks (United States) and Lord Herschell.

WEDNESDAY, August 24.—Polling took place in the Southport Division to fill the vacancy in the Parliamentary representation caused by the appointment of Mr. Curzon to be Viceroy of India. Sir H. S. Naylor-Leyland, the Liberal candidate, not only captured the seat, but defeated his opponent, Lord Skelmersdale, by a majority exceeding that cast for Dr. Pilkington in 1885, and increased his own poll of the last General Election by 700 votes. The figures were: Sir H. S. Naylor-Leyland, 5,100; Lord Skelmersdale, 4,828. Majority, 272. At the General Election Mr. Curzon's majority was 764. Commenting on the result, the *Standard* condescended to observe: "There is undeniably some lack of positive enthusiasm for the Ministry and their policy." The *Times* wrote: "It is, to say the least, remarkable that at this moment the seat of the official representative of the Government's China policy should have been filled by a member of the Opposition." But why "remarkable?"

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

### THE POLICE AT THE GARSHANKAR RIOT.

To the Editor of "India."

SIR,—When I wrote an account of the Garshankar riot in the Punjab I was not in possession of the official reports on the riot. Contrary to the usual practice of all Local Governments on such an occasion, of publishing the reports of the local officers along with the remarks and orders of the Government, the Punjab Government has withheld from publication all the local official reports on the riot. In reply, however, to certain criticisms that appeared in the *Tribune*, the *Civil and Military Gazette*, the local Anglo-Indian paper, published a long leading article defending the police. In this article lengthy extracts have been freely made from those identical official reports, and it would be interesting to learn how that particular paper had access to official papers which have not been made public.

But the publication of these extracts is by no means to be regretted. If anything were wanted to prove conclusively that the police fired on the crowd without orders and in defiance of every rule of discipline, these extracts supply that omission. Mr. Leslie-Jones, C.S., the magistrate under whose orders the police were placed, submitted a written report, from which I make the following extract:—

"I then heard shots in front, and I thought that the police had been fired on from in front; this impression being strengthened by the fact that the police between myself and Mr. Hadow stopped, and some of them turned, and also by *the knowledge that the police had received no orders to fire.* I then rode forward, but while doing so saw that some of the police were levelling their rifles and firing. *I then turned and faced the men, shouting to them to stop firing, as also did Mr. Hadow, but although I struck one or two of them they continued firing past us at the mob.* By this time the men behind were also firing, and before they were all stopped I think that they must have fired between twenty-five and thirty shots, but I am not certain on this point. Mr. Hadow then got his men to march on down the road, and I followed with the remaining body, overtaking Mr. Hadow at the corner, where the street turns out to join the main road. Meanwhile the shower of missiles (bricks and clods of earth) continued, and as the police wheeled to march out, they again became exasperated by the bricks that were being thrown from behind from the roofs, and turned to fire. After firing a few shots they were again stopped by Major Inglis, Mr. Turnbull, the District Superintendent of police, Mr. Hadow and myself; but in the meanwhile some of the men in the road outside, who were being held in reserve by Mr. Barr, Assistant District Superintendent of police, also began firing at the crowd over our heads. This was soon stopped."

The italics are mine. This report establishes the following facts:—

1. The police fired on five occasions, from five different places, and they did not content themselves with firing a single volley each time.
2. They fired every time without orders.
3. The party under Mr. Leslie-Jones fired in disobedience of orders to cease fire.
4. They fired in spite of his physical attempts to stop the firing.
5. During all that time discipline was at an end. The police got entirely out of control of the officers present, and were not acting as public servants.
6. They did not stop the firing until they had fired as long and as many shots as they liked.
7. During the time the police were firing the authority of the officers present was in abeyance, and all their efforts were directed to stop the firing.
8. The party of police held in reserve by Mr. Barr were out of the range of the shower of bricks and had received no provocation whatever.

The *Civil and Military Gazette*, either to justify or to palliate the conduct of the police, writes:—

The men who carried the carbines were all Pathans, undisciplined and very excitable.

It should be enquired why such men were employed on a duty in which discipline and coolness are the first indispensable qualities. This fact, however, is no defence or justification for what the police did.

The *Simla News*, an Anglo-Indian paper, published at Simla during the season, commenting on this particular incident, says the authorities blundered in investing with authority and fire-arms men who were undisciplined and very excitable. It proceeds:—

To attempt to rule a populace or quell a mob with such an instrument as this under the name of a Police Force is to court riot and bloodshed. It is simply opposing mob to mob, one mob being armed with carbines, while the other is armed with sticks and stones. Police constables who first begin firing on a crowd without orders, and then refuse to stop firing on the most emphatic orders of their own officers, are not fit to be entrusted with carbines, and so far from quelling

disorder are only likely to increase it. They are no instrument of civilised government.

There was no departmental enquiry or investigation into the open and persistent disobedience of orders by the police and the breach of discipline. They were not placed on their trial for voluntarily causing death and grievous hurt in excess of the right of private defence, as defined by the Indian Penal Code. And they have not been censured by the Local Government.

Yours, etc.,

Lahore, July 28, 1898. N. GUPTA.

## AN ANGLO-INDIAN TORY ON JINGOISM.

TO THE EDITOR OF "INDIA."

SIR,—I am a staunch Tory, yet for years I have not swerved in my allegiance to the rayat, notwithstanding the fact that I have lost the friendship and love of those who are nearest and dearest to me. This statement is drawn from me owing to the remarks which were made by Mr. Hume and by other Radicals at the breakfast given in honour of Mr. W. A. Chambers. I must, however, confess that Sir James Westland is the stamp of Tory whom I distrust even more than I do a moneyed Radical, and the following extract from a letter which I addressed to Sir Antony MacDonnell on July 17, 1892, will show that I draw a distinction between Anglo-Indian Jingoes and true Conservatives:—

"To give an idea of what is being done in Ireland, I may mention that I have before me the First Annual Report of the Congested Districts Board, in which it is shown that the Board has a large income from various sources, which is devoted for improving the congested districts, in connexion with the following subjects:—

(1.) Agricultural development.
(2.) Forestry.
(3.) Breeding of live-stock and poultry.
(4.) Sale of seed potatoes and seed oats.
(5.) Amalgamation of small holdings.
(6.) Migration.
(7.) Emigration.
(8.) Fishing and matters subservient to fishing.
(9.) Weaving and spinning.
(10.) Any other suitable industries.

And, 'it is enacted that agriculture and industries in their various branches may be aided and developed by indirect as well as by direct means.' Now, if Ireland had an industry like indigo to assist the congested districts in the way that I propose for Behar, the British public would hear very little about the Irish question and Irish grievances. I have also before me the copy of a speech made by the late Mr. John Bright, at a meeting of the members of the East India Association, which very clearly states the duty of Government towards the Indian rayat. All these papers are very suggestive reading, and prove that a strong sense of duty governs the actions of the people of England. And I believe that it is a mistake to think, as some people do think in India, that this sentiment is confined to one particular set of Englishmen, and therefore it ought to be sneered at. Jingoism is often mistaken for Conservatism by the blatant Cockney, and Jingoes are in the majority in India. But there are Conservatives who work heart and soul for the good of the people with whom they are connected, and I may mention as a fact that the best-managed estates in England are in the hands of Conservatives; the best English regiments are officered by Conservatives, who understand and sympathise with their men; the flower of our womenkind, those devoted and true-hearted girls who leave comfortable homes, and give up their whole existence to doing good, and to nursing the poor and the sick in our hospitals, are generally the daughters of Conservatives. All these people have grasped the meaning of true Conservativism, and their example should be followed by the Jingoes in India who mistake selfishness and a mean-spirited cynicism for the whole duty of man. It is the Cockney Jingoism of India that has blighted agricultural reform in this country."

Sir James Westland is a Scotsman, and I have in my possession an old directory for the year 1843, which gives the names of the principal residents in the rural districts of Scotland. The name of Westland, however, is conspicuous by its absence.

Yours, etc.,

DONALD N. REID.

1, Dudley Place, St. Mary's Square, Paddington,
August, 1898.

## THE DEBATE ON THE "INDIAN BUDGET."

### SOME PRESS OPINIONS—GOOD, BAD, AND INDIFFERENT.

THE "MANCHESTER GUARDIAN."

The debate last night in the House of Commons on the new Indian Press laws, and the attention which the new legislation has attracted in this country, will not be fruitless, though there does not appear to be any immediate prospect of amendment or repeal. There will now be far less danger of the new enactments being worked harshly than there might have been if there had been no sign of resentment in England at the subjection of the Indian Press to measures of harsh repression. "There is no real reason for all this outcry," was the argument of Lord George Hamilton and his supporters yesterday. "We have only made the substantive law of sedition more certain and definite, and have brought it into more strict accordance with English law." That may be; but the English law when it was worked by judges alarmed for society and by subservient juries was an engine of oppression. Nowadays it is but a rusty machine because, worked as it must be with the aid of independent juries, it is rarely set in action. In India trial by jury is the exception and not the rule, but until recently the man accused of sedition had at any rate this safeguard, that he would be tried by an independent and experienced judge, who would be assisted either by assessors, or, in some parts of India, by a jury. The recent legislation has removed this safeguard, for courts of a lower class have been given power to try such offences. The reason for this change was not stated in yesterday's debate. Sir A. Scoble, no doubt in all good faith, simply denied the fact, and said that the allegation was merely a mare's nest discovered by Mr. Herbert Roberts. But it was Sir A. Scoble's interpretation of the law which was wrong. He can easily satisfy himself of this by a reference to the debates in the Viceroy's Legislative Council or by a little more careful study of the Code. His mistake was convenient, for it threw a cloud of obscurity over a very weak point of the Government's defence, and Lord George Hamilton did not think it necessary to state and defend the real fact that the change of jurisdiction had been made. It is this change and the subjection of sedition to the preventive procedure of taking security for good behaviour that really gave the sting to the whole legislation. But, argued Lord George Hamilton, ought preachers of sedition to be specially favoured and allowed to go unpunished, or should they not be liable to give security like other offenders? Security is not demanded from men who can be proved to have committed offences; they are tried and sentenced; they are not allowed to go off unpunished merely because they are able to give security for their future behaviour. It is the men who are dangerous to society, but against whom proof of actual specific crimes is wanting, who are put on security. If men preach sedition in the Press they do it publicly and can be tried. It is an abuse of the law to apply to them preventive provisions hitherto only used as a restraint on the most dangerous classes of criminals. And it is, further, a degradation to the whole class of editors to make them liable to this treatment, carrying with it as it does the possibility of imprisonment with hard labour. Sir A. Scoble denied this again, but his information is out of date. Lord George Hamilton declares that he welcomes criticism; he only wants to guide and elevate the Press; but he is very certainly going the wrong way to work. He has a real difficulty to face, and, as he rightly stated, the difficulty is of our own creation. We might have contented ourselves with giving to India a stable strong rule of an oriental type; we have rightly not contented ourselves with this, but have extended to India the benefits of Western education, and we have imbued those whom we have thus educated with ideas of the personal rights of subjects and of the responsibility of rulers. We have done well—unless, indeed, oriental ideas on the subject of political and individual rights are truer and higher than those of the West. Lord George Hamilton says the protests against the recent legislation came altogether from the semi-Anglicised class, that no orthodox Hindu gentleman raised any objection. The orthodox Hindu is often a charming old gentleman, the semi-Anglicised Native is sometimes bumptious and not very amenable to the sympathetic guidance of which he stands in need; but the one is the product of ages of stagnation, the other has been infused with some measure of our own spirit of progress. By his aid we may eventually make a success of the great experiment of the government of India by so utterly different a race as the English. But the educated class will, from the very influence of our own teaching, bitterly resent anything which seems to it degradation or injustice, and its members will naturally, and quite justly, regard parts of the recent legislation as removing from them valuable guarantees of a fair trial in the courts, and as unnecessarily making them liable to a procedure which is undoubtedly looked upon in India as degrading and dishonouring.

THE "ST. JAMES'S GAZETTE."

As the House of Commons approaches the blessed hour of release from its duties (to which about two-thirds of the honourable members contrive to pay very moderate attention), it always has a sleepy little tamasha on the Indian Budget, just to show that it really does govern India. The proceedings on this occasion are uniformly of a nature to prove how fortunate it is that the House lets India severely alone at other times. Yesterday afforded no exception to the rule. Mr. Herbert Roberts gave a beautiful example of the utter inability of certain members to master the first elementary facts of the problem he undertook to handle, which is that India is not England, and Asia is not Europe. He held forth on the law relating to sedition and the control of the Press in blissful ignorance of these patent truths. Moreover, he gave a telling example of what House of Commons criticism on the Government of India is by solemnly telling the Cabinet that "previous attempts to control the Native Press had proved a failure." And what is the reason for the failure? It is simply this, that Parliament has foolishly interfered with the Indian Government, which knew what it was doing. The plain truth is, as Lord George Hamilton told Mr. Roberts, that her Majesty's subjects in India have a freedom unknown elsewhere in Asia. It has been misused by certain intriguers who preach sedition. Nothing will satisfy these persons except the overthrow of the British rule altogether. Does Mr. Herbert Roberts want that? If not, why does he try to help the intriguers?

THE "DAILY NEWS."

The new Press Law is the offspring of panic. Editors of newspapers can now be imprisoned in India for twelve months without a trial, which is not encouraging to the profession of journalism. The Solicitor-General, who from his profound acquaintance with Indian subjects undertook to reply for the Treasury Bench, delivered himself of a remarkable sentence. "We have given liberty to India," he

said, "and it is to be regretted that a limited section of the community should use that liberty to attack their benefactors." The British Philistine never concocted a purer specimen of the quality for which he is justly and universally famous. Sir Robert Finlay is indignant at the notion that the Indian Government wish to restrict in any way the freedom of the Press. The Indian newspapers are perfectly free to praise the Government, to flatter the Government, and to thank the Government for giving them freedom. They may even criticise the Government if the Government think the criticism fair. But of course, if the Government think the criticism unfair, they must for the sake of social order be allowed to imprison the critics, without a trial, for a reasonable time. Otherwise nobody would be safe. The Solicitor-General is convinced from the plenitude of his knowledge that the people of India have no sympathy with these articles. No general statement is true about the people of India, many of whom do not know what a newspaper is. But if the Solicitor-General were accurate, the inference would be that the articles could do no possible harm, not that the writers ought to be put in gaol. The fact is that Lord Elgin was carried away by the apprehension which seized the official class after the murders at Poona, and the new Viceroy could not begin his career better than by repealing the Press Law.

THE "STANDARD."

As regards the criticism of measures recently adopted by Lord Elgin and his advisers, for curbing the licence of the Native Press, the objections urged by Mr. Roberts and Sir William Wedderburn were quickly disposed of. It is too soon to say whether the amendment of the law relating to seditious libel—in which an attempt was made to define the offence more accurately, as well as to simplify the course of procedure—has been wholly successful; but to suggest, as Sir William Wedderburn did, that the Indian Government has borrowed the methods of Russia in order to stifle the voice of the people, is merely an absurdity. As Lord George Hamilton observed, the Native journals continued to discuss public events with a freedom and vigour of expression which altogether preclude the idea that they have been muzzled; and the only doubt is whether it will not be Mr. Curzon's duty, when he assumes office, to find a more adequate means of preventing a serious danger to public tranquillity. It does not follow that harsher legislation is required. In the opinion of many people, the powers conferred by law on the Executive are already sufficient, and all that is needed is their wiser application.

THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW."

Who has read it? As many as listened to it? We should be rash to try to guess, but feel satisfied that not a man in a million has cared a brass button about gagging Press laws, Contagious Diseases Acts, or anything else talked about a week ago in the House of Commons. The discussion on higher education was illuminated by an able speech from Mr. Robinson Souttar, and Sir William Wedderburn once more took up his parable on behalf of the tax-milked Native whose horizon is gradually closing in as he sinks deeper into debt and the slavery of debt, even as the walls of the Inquisition prison chamber contracted upon the doomed prisoner in Poe's story; and again nobody cared. Is not the apathy of the nation to all that bears upon the well-being and stability of our Indian empire an ominous fact? The Dargai piper's piping we can effervesce about as something that proves the old cattle-lifting or border-raiding "heroism" to be still alive in us—we must be constantly pinching ourselves, as it were, to be sure of our courage—but language like the following from Sir William Wedderburn's speech is but as the sough of a wandering wind through a wood that is dead.

THE "PALL MALL GAZETTE."

The fag-end of the Session is the least inappropriate time for such a debate as that initiated by Mr. Herbert Roberts. It must needs be that these threadbare absurdities come while we have our Padgetts and Wedderburns with us; but it is a merciful dispensation which shunts them until a large proportion of the Legislature has got away. At any other time one might feel some indignation at the sight of a man who has served in India, and ought to know better, talking about "Russianised methods," and asserting that the Indian Native Press is stifled because our administration will not bear criticism. Just now it is too hot and grouse-like to feel even amused. Lord George Hamilton is the man to be pitied; he had to explain once more that the "amendment" of the law does not alter it. It only defines it, and makes it clearer that, whereas fair criticism and complaints are to be tolerated, deliberate attempts to excite disaffection are not. The bearings lie in the application. We have confidence in the Indian judges, Sir William Wedderburn in the Tilaks and Ghoklees—that is all.

THE "STAR."

Of course the chief topic of the evening was the new law of sedition, by which the Government of India, under orders from Lord George Hamilton, has aimed a deadly blow at honest journalism and public speaking. The amendment which condemned this suicidal legislation was rejected by a majority of 36. It is not a large majority, and it is reasonable to assume that if the Front Opposition Bench had done its duty the majority would have been much smaller. But we look in vain for the name of any "Liberal leader" in the division list, and Mr. Pickersgill, in the course of his able and searching speech, called attention to the fact that Sir Henry Fowler was not present. Frankly, we should like to know what the Liberal leaders imagine that they stand to gain by obliterating themselves on an occasion so important to the principles of Liberalism. For what the Government of India has done is to throw over both within and without the frontiers of India the great Liberal policy of Lord Lawrence and Lord Ripon. The Government's bogey is Russia. Accordingly it squanders the resources of India upon crazy military schemes designed to keep Russia out, while it adopts repressive legislation admirably calculated to make Indians reflect that it might be little worse for them if Russia were in. Lord George Hamilton had simply no defence to offer. He has been thrown over, poor man, by everybody—including even the Anglo-Indian journals. Mr. Curzon has himself been a journalist. Is it too much to hope that he at any rate may perceive the folly of legislation designed to reduce the Indian Press either to impotent silence or to perilous hypocrisy?

THE "MORNING POST."

The confusion of thought that afflicts the House of Commons when it comes to deal with Indian affairs was painfully exhibited last evening. The member of Parliament who has no chance of getting a hearing on home subjects devotes his leisure to the study of Indian Codes and Statistics, and in the sere and yellow leaf of the Session appears as an authority on questions for which the constituencies are told they are responsible, but about which the general stock of knowledge is uncommonly small. The man who has been to India is listened to with open mouth by a small number of members whose desire to do their duty is in inverse proportion to their acquaintance with Indian affairs, while their instructor is generally totally incapable of any conception outside parochial politics. The debate on Mr. Roberts's motion condemning the new law relating to sedition was a fine example of this waste of public time.

THE "SCOTSMAN."

India sits heavy on the conscience of the voluntary protectors of its interests in the House of Commons. They are the devoted and the only champions of an oppressed people. It is their special business to ventilate Indian grievances in Parliament. Usually they import these grievances ready made by the Indian National Congress or the Vernacular Press, but sometimes they manufacture them in London. They are never without at least one good-going grievance to agitate about. The principal one they now have on hand is called the gagging of the Indian Press, and as they could not have another financial debate yesterday, they substituted a discussion on the recent alteration of the Press law. Mr. Herbert Roberts, who has somehow got it into his head that he understands India better than the Viceroy and all his councillors, met the motion to go into Committee with a resolution calling for the repeal of the amended law of sedition. He was supported by Sir William Wedderburn, who does know something about India. He was a civil servant in India, and a friend of the Native. Unfortunately, he was also what is called a crank. He tried to see things from the Native point of view, and in endeavouring to twist himself into the Native position distorted his mind. His sympathies are always with the discontented and disloyal sections of the Indian people, and against the Government and its executive officers. If anything goes wrong in India he sets it down to the wrongdoing of his countrymen. He is more anti-British than the Mahratta Brahmins.

THE "BIRMINGHAM DAILY POST."

Before the accounts could be reached another academic discussion was forced on a jaded House by Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree, who is supposed to represent the best interests of Bethnal Green by airing periodically in Parliament his particular views on how to govern India. Last night he directed his attention to the system of education, which, he argued, had proved ineffectual to direct the energies of the people of India to technical and industrial pursuits, with the result that the productive power of the country had been arrested. Nothing is more easy than to collect together in a striking manner the worst social features of any people or any section of the people. This has been the business of a certain class of politicians in all countries; and the member for Bethnal Green never loses an opportunity of painting in lurid colours the condition of the poorer classes in India. He talked last night of their helplessness, their discontent, their need of the stimulating influence of technical education.

THE "DAILY MAIL."

Some day there will perhaps arise at Westminster a critic of the Indian Government who is endowed with the gift of eloquence, intimate knowledge of his subject, and that sympathy which is the attribute of the highest criticism. When the man arrives, the Indian Budget debate will no longer take place with a meagre attendance of less than one hundred members.

---

Lord Elgin stays at Simla until the beginning of November, when he intends to pay a short visit to Burma before returning to England. Mr. George Curzon will arrive at Calcutta and take up the duties of Viceroy during the last week of December.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. John Stanley, Q.C., of the Irish Bar, to be a Judge of the High Court of Judicature at Calcutta in succession to Mr. Justice Trevelyan.

Mr. Stanley is a distinguished graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, where he obtained a scholarship and gold medal in classics. He was called to the Bar in 1870, became a Q.C. in 1889, and was elected a Bencher of the King's Inns last year. He has enjoyed for many years a large practice in commercial cases. Sir John Edge, Q.C., who was appointed to the Chief Justiceship of the North-West Provinces in 1886, is an Irishman and a member of the Irish Bar, to which he was called in 1864. He was, however, called to the English Bar in 1866, and had practised in England uninterruptedly before his promotion for twenty years. Mr. Stanley is the first Irish practising barrister appointed to the Indian Judicial Bench since 1865, when Mr. James Keenan, an Irish Queen's Counsel, was made a judge of the High Court of Madras.

The Queen has been pleased to appoint Mr. Arundel Tagg Arundel, of the Civil Service of India in the Madras Presidency, to be a Member of the Council of the Governor of Fort St. George, in succession to Mr. James Grose, C.I.E., deceased.

It is announced that sanitary precautions have been instituted in all the great ports of France against the introduction of cholera from India.

## NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

**Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to**

**THE MANAGER,**
**84 & 85, Palace Chambers,**
**Westminster, S.W.**

**Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.**

---

NOW READY.

**Price One Shilling and Sixpence, net. In India, 1 Rupee.**

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOK: No. 2.

# ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

## EVIDENCE-IN-CHIEF OF THE FIVE INDIAN WITNESSES.

*Large foolscap*, 116 *pp.*

Published by the
BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

N.B.—The postage of each copy is 4d., in addition to the price stated above.

---

**P. & O.** COMPANY'S INDIA, CHINA, AND AUSTRALIAN MAIL SERVICES.

**P. & O.** FREQUENT SAILINGS TO GIBRALTAR, MARSEILLES, MALTA, EGYPT, ADEN, BOMBAY, KURRACHEE, CALCUTTA, CEYLON, STRAITS, CHINA, JAPAN, AUSTRALIA, TASMANIA, and NEW ZEALAND.

**P. & O.** CHEAP RETURN TICKETS AND ROUND THE WORLD TOURS.
For particulars apply at the London Offices, 122, Leadenhall Street, E.C., or 25, Cockspur Street, S.W.

---

**6d. Weekly.]**

## THE "HOME NEWS"

**Is the BEST SUMMARY of EUROPEAN INTELLIGENCE**
SPECIALLY PREPARED FOR
**INDIA, CEYLON, CHINA, and AUSTRALASIA.**
*PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY.*

**THE "HOME NEWS"** Will keep readers posted up in all Political, Social, Literary, Dramatic, and other movements.

**THE "HOME NEWS"** Contains Original and Special Matter, and gives the cream of the European Newspapers.

*Ask the Local Newsagent to get it, or send Subscription direct to the Publisher.*

Subscription, including postage, payable in advance—

| Period. | All places abroad. | In United Kingdom. |
|---|---|---|
| Three Months... | £0 7 7 | £0 7 1 |
| Six Months ... | 0 15 9 | 0 14 1 |
| One Year ... | 1 10 4 | 8 2 |

CHEQUES AND P.O. ORDERS TO BE MADE TO THE ORDER OF GRINDLAY & CO.

OFFICES: 56, PARLIAMENT STREET, LONDON, S.W.

---

## CLARENDON PRESS, OXFORD.

SUPPLEMENTARY VOLUME TO THE RULERS OF INDIA.
NOW READY, crown 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d.

**SIR HENRY LAWRENCE, the PACIFICATOR.** By Lieut.-General J. J. McLEOD INNES, R.E., V.C.

JUST PUBLISHED, 8vo, cloth, 21s.

**THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA: Being a** Digest of the Statute Law relating thereto, with Historical introduction and Illustrative Documents by SIR COURTENAY ILBERT, K.C.S.I., Assistant Parliamentary Counsel to the Treasury, sometime Law Member of the Council of the Governor-General of India.

*ATHENÆUM.*—"Sir Courtenay Ilbert is more than any other man competent to undertake such a work as that before us. We welcome his volume as supplying a practical code of high authority. The book is also one which will probably be chosen as a University text-book for the use of students of our constitutional system and of its Indian laws."

CROWN 8VO, CLOTH.

**A HINDUSTANI GRAMMAR.** By COLONEL GREEN, R.E.
PART I., 8s. 6d.; PART II., 7s. 6d.

REDUCED IN PRICE from £4 14s. 6d. to £2 2s.

**A SANSKRIT-ENGLISH DICTIONARY.** Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with special reference to Greek, Latin, German, Anglo-Saxon, English, and other cognate Indo-European Languages. By Sir M. MONIER WILLIAMS, D.C.L. 4to, cloth back, stiff boards.

SACRED BOOKS OF THE EAST.
Edited by the Right Hon. F. MAX MÜLLER.
NEW EDITION, 10s. 6d.

**Vol. X. THE DHAMMAPADA. Translated** from Pâli by F. MAX MÜLLER. And the SUTTA-NIPATA, translated from Pâli by V. FAUSBOLL. Being one of the Canonical Books of the Buddhists.

LONDON: HENRY FROWDE, CLARENDON PRESS WAREHOUSE, AMEN CORNER, E.C.

---

## THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS:

ITS AIMS AND JUSTIFICATION.

[Being a reprint of certain articles on the subject in the *Statesman and Friend of India.*]

BY ROBERT KNIGHT.

CALCUTTA: Published at the *Statesman* Office.

The above will be sent to any address on receipt of 1d. stamp for postage. Application should be made to the Manager of "INDIA," 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

---

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

## PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

**For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.**

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.

---

# TOOTH-ACHE

CURED INSTANTLY BY

**BUNTER'S** Prevents Decay, Saves Extraction, Sleepless Nights Prevented.

Neuralgic Headaches and all Nerve Pains removed by BUNTER'S NERVINE. All Chemists, 1s. 1½d. **NERVINE**

---

# "Louene"

## A Simple, Safe, & Reliable NERVE SEDATIVE.

GUARANTEED PURELY VEGETABLE AND NEITHER OPIATE NOR NARCOTIC IN ITS ACTION.

**For NEURALGIA, NERVOUS HEADACHE, FACEACHE, SLEEPLESSNESS, and other Nervous Troubles.**

The EARL OF MOUNT-CASHELL writes: "Acted like magic, and relieved pain almost immediately."

The COUNTESS OF BANTRY writes: "A good remedy for sleeplessness.

PRICES, 2/9 and 4/6 per bottle. Post free in the United Kingdom, 3/- and 4/9. Foreign postage extra.

Pamphlet, containing many valuable Medical and other Testimonials, post free on application to

THE LOUENE CO., 43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.